



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,962	08/26/2003	Martin Lund	14225US02	5246
23446 7590 03/25/2008 MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD 500 WEST MADISON STREET SUITE 3400 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, HANH N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2616				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/647,962

Applicant(s)

LUND ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE filed on 1/22/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petty et al. (US Pat. 7,188,209 B2) in view of Bottom et al. (US Pat. 7,339,786 B2)..

In Claims 1, 11, 21, Petty et al. discloses a server platform (see fig.1, a multiserver system 100) comprising a plurality of blade servers 102, 104 and 106 (col.8, lines 44-46; a first blade server and a second blade server) connected to an ethernet network 128, fibre channel network 130 and other networks such as infiniband network 132 (see fig.1; col.9, lines 45-55& col.10, lines 5-10). Each servers comprises a root complex 108 used as a transmitter to send data to other servers through networks (see col.10, lines 20-30). Refer to fig.19, a share switch 1910 receives packet A from root complex 1902 (col.26, lines 5-10; receiving from a first blade server a first packet). Switch 1910 uses information in the packet A, performs a table lookup to determine which of the target downstreams controllers 1912, 1914 or 1916 the packet A is transmitted to (see col.26, lines 10-15; determining whether one or both of at least a second blade server of said plurality of blade servers and a network is to receive said at least first packet); and transferring data responsive to said received at least said first packet to one or both of said determined at least said second blade server at a negotiated rate (see col.26, lines 20-26; switch

1910 routes packet A to controller 1912) and said determined network at a second data rate (to ethernet network 1920).

Petty et al. does not disclose negotiating a data rate for transfer of data between said first blade server and at least said second blade server. Bottom et al. discloses in fig. 1A, col.3, lines 32-65; a modular server system 100 (a server platform) comprising switch blade 120 (switch blade) and a plurality of blade servers 110 connected via midplane 170. The switch blade 120 is capable of 10/100 base-T auto-negotiating between 16 blade servers 110 (rate negotiating from first rate to second rate and vice versa between said first blade server and said second blade server). Further, the switch blade 120 also performs network switching between server blades (see col.8, lines 30-38).

With the teachings of Bottom above, it would have been obvious to use the switch blade 120 with 10/100 Base-T auto-negotiation capability into Petty so that the packet transmission between blade servers can be negotiated accordingly and prevent congestion.

*In claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 22 and 23, Petty et al. discloses transferring at least a second packet comprising at least a portion of said at least said first received packet to said second blade server via a common bus at said negotiated data rate (see col.26, lines 22-27; transmitting packet B to Fibre channel controller 1914 at negotiated data rate).

*In claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24 and 25, Petty et al. discloses receiving a third packet from the network at a second data rate (see col.26, lines 5-25, from root complex 1902, packet C is transmitted to switch 1910 for delivered to infiniband controller 1916).

*In claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 26 and 27, Petty et al. disclose transferring data responsive to the third packet to the third blade server at a newly negotiated data rate (transmitting packet G from infiniband 1916; col.26, lines 60-65).

*In claims 8, 18, 28, Petty discloses transferring a fourth packet to said network via a network interface at a second data rate (see col.26, lines 5-27; transmitting packet C from root complex 1902 via switch 1910 to infiniband network 1924)

*In claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 29 and 30, Petty et al. discloses broadcasting a plurality of packets over the network at a second data rate (transmitting packets A, G from root complex 1902 and 1916 to ethernet 1920). See fig.19.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

King et al. (US pat. 7,174,375 B2);

Garnett et al. (Us pat. 7,032,037 B2);

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh Nguyen whose telephone number is 571 272 3092. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 4:30. The examiner can also be reached on alternate

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild, can be reached on 571 272 2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hanh Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2616